APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,077	10/21/2003	William R. Jones	P24200	6126

			EXAMINER
29858	7590	09/19/2006	TRAN, QUOC DUC

BROWN, RAYSMAN, MILLSTEIN, FELDER & STEINER LLP
900 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2614	

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/689,077	JONES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Quoc D. Tran	2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 July 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.　　The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.　　Claims 1-3, 5-9, 10-15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Watkins et al (5,850,426) in view of Glaser et al (5,875,242).

　　　　Consider claim 1, Watkins et al teach an apparatus (Fig. 1: centralize system 116) for

integrating a plurality of maintenance and testing systems that communicate with a plurality of

disparate systems (Fig. 1: reporting systems 104-114), comprising: a platform that supports a

control interface (col. 3 line 66 – col. 4 line 12) and a different user interface for each of the

plurality of disparate systems (col. 4 lines 21-55 and Fig. 8), said platform enabling the

formatting and transfer (i.e. communicating) of data to each of said plurality of disparate systems

(col. 2 lines 29-35; col. 4 lines 21-27).

　　　　Watkins et al did not specifically suggest the control interface allows a to login and

perform testing, trouble-shooting or billing updates. However, Glaser et al suggested such (see

abstract; col. 8 lines 48-61; col. 18 lines 4-50).

　　　　Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Glaser et al into view of Watkins et al for

providing a single point of control and for reduce the amount of entry.

Consider claim 2, Watkins et al teaches said control interface enabling a user to selectively access each of the different user interfaces (col. 5 lines 1-65).

Consider claim 3, Watkins et al teach where said disparate systems comprising a testing system that performs <u>at least one</u> of remote testing of analog services and testing of ISDN switches (col. 15-25; col. 8 lines 31-39).

Consider claim 4, Glaser et al teach the claimed limitation (see col. 18 lines 4-8).

Consider claim 5, Watkins et al teach wherein said platform enabling a user to select at <u>least one of</u> a printer setup routine, an employee activity input routine, a timesheet routine, a control interface parameter selection routine, an alarm routine, a default email setting routine, an exit routine, an activity information backup routine, a work and force administration/control routine that enables the user to further select one of a plurality of activities, a security routine, a windows cascade routine, a help routine, a windows select routine that enables the user to further select one of a plurality of available windows, a save placement routine that enables the user to save a configuration of the platform, a platform information routine, a ticket maintenance routine, a specify ticket routine that enables a user to select a ticket, a specify circuit routine that enables a user to specify a circuit, a trouble report processing routine, a work and force administration and control routine that enables the user to select an information screen associated with a ticket, and a close application routine (col. 7 lines 15-25).

Consider claim 6, Watkins et al teach said platform enabling a user to select one of the different user interfaces and at least one of review and update information associated with a customer authorization request (col. 5 line 58 – col. 6 line 14).

Consider claim 7, Watkins et al teach said different user interfaces each enabling a user to at least one of retrieve and update information associated with one of the plurality of disparate systems (col. 5 line 58 – col. 6 line 14).

Consider claim 8, Watkins et al teach an apparatus (Fig. 1: centralize system 116) for integrating a plurality of maintenance and testing systems that communicate with a plurality of disparate telecommunications systems (Fig. 1: reporting systems 104-114; col. 7 lines 6-31), comprising: a platform that supports a control interface (col. 3 line 66 – col. 4 line 12) and a different user interface for each of the plurality of disparate telecommunications systems (col. 4 lines 21-55 and Fig. 8-9), said platform permitting parallel asynchronous testing of at least two of said disparate telecommunications systems that are connected to the platform (col. 7 lines 41-56; col. 8 lines 22-39).

Watkins et al did not specifically suggest the control interface allows a to login and perform testing, trouble-shooting or billing updates. However, Glaser et al suggested such (see abstract; col. 8 lines 48-61; col. 18 lines 4-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Glaser et al into view of Watkins et al for providing a single point of control and for reduce the amount of entry.

Consider claim 9, Watkins et al teach where said platform performing at least one of remote testing of analog services and testing of ISDN switches in accordance with vendor-specific criteria (col. 15-25; col. 8 lines 31-39).

Consider claim 10, Watkins et al teach where each of said different user interfaces comprising a graphical user interface (GUI) that facilitates at least one of retrieving data and entering data (Fig. 8-9).

Consider claim 11, Watkins et al teach where said platform sending and receiving data between said platform and said disparate telecommunications systems (col. 7 lines 57-67).

Consider claim 12, Watkins et al teach where said control interface enabling a user to access each of the different user interfaces (col. 5 lines 1-65).

Consider claim 13, Watkins et al teach where said different user interfaces each enabling a user to at least one of retrieve and update information associated with one of the plurality of disparate telecommunications systems (col. 5 line 58 – col. 6 line 14).

Consider claim 14, Watkins et al teach a computer readable medium for storing a program (Fig. 1: centralize system 116; col. 3 lines 60-65) that integrates a plurality of maintenance and testing systems that communicate with a plurality of disparate telecommunications systems (Fig. 1: reporting systems 104-114; col. 7 lines 6-31), comprising: a plurality of different user interfaces each communicating with one of the plurality of disparate telecommunications systems, said plurality of different user interfaces interoperating with the plurality of disparate telecommunications systems (col. 4 lines 21-55 and Fig. 8-9); and a control interface (col. 3 line 66 – col. 4 line 12), said control interface enabling the formatting and transfer of data from to each of said plurality of disparate systems (col. 2 lines 29-35; col. 4 lines 21-27), said control interface enabling a user to access each of the different user interfaces (col. 5 lines 1-65).

Watkins et al did not specifically suggest the control interface allows a to login and

perform testing, trouble-shooting or billing updates. However, Glaser et al suggested such (see

abstract; col. 8 lines 48-61; col. 18 lines 4-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Glaser et al into view of Watkins et al for

providing a single point of control and for reduce the amount of entry.

Consider claim 15, Watkins et al teach where said disparate systems including a testing

system that performs <u>at least one</u> of remote testing of analog services and testing of ISDN

switches (col. 15-25; col. 8 lines 31-39).

Consider claim 16, Glaser et al teach the claimed limitation (see col. 18 lines 4-8).

Consider claim 17, Watkins et al teach wherein said control interface enabling a user to

select at least one of a printer setup routine, an employee activity input routine, a timesheet

routine, a common user interface parameter selection routine, an alarm routine, a default email

setting routine, an exit routine, an activity information backup routine, a work and force

administration/control routine that enables the user to further select one of a plurality of

activities, a security routine, a windows cascade routine, a help routine, a windows select routine

that enables the user to further select one of a plurality of available windows, a save placement

routine that enables the user to save a configuration of the platform, a platform information

routine, a ticket maintenance routine, a specify ticket routine that enables a user to select a ticket,

a specify circuit routine that enables a user to specify a circuit, a trouble report processing

routine, a work and force administration and control routine that enables the user to select an

information screen associated with a ticket, and a close application routine (col. 7 lines 15-25).

Consider claim 18, Watkins et al teach where said control interface enabling a user to select one of the different user interfaces and at least one of review and update information associated with a customer authorization request (col. 5 line 58 – col. 6 line 14).

Consider claim 19, Watkins et al teach where said different user interfaces each enabling a user to at least one of retrieve and update information associated with one of the plurality of disparate systems (col. 5 line 58 – col. 6 line 14).

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

5.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6.   Any response to this action should be mailed to:

> Mail Stop ____(explanation, e.g., Amendment or After-final, etc.)
> Commissioner for Patents
> P.O. Box 1450
> Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
> Facsimile responses should be faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

> Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:
> Customer Service Window
> Randolph Building
> 401 Dulany Street
> Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Quoc Tran** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7511**. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T, TH and Friday from 8:00 to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Curtis Kuntz**, can be reached on **(571) 272-7499**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Technology Center 2600** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2600**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

QUOC TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
AU 2614
September 12, 2006